



WATER QUALITY MEMORANDUM

Utah Coal Regulatory Program

September 9, 2004

TO: Internal File

THRU: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor 

FROM: James D. Smith, Senior Reclamation Specialist 

RE: 2004 First Quarter Water Monitoring, CO-OP Mining Company, Bear Canyon Mine, C/015/0025-WQ04-1, Task # 1960

1. Were data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES ☒ NO ☐
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

SBC-11 has not been not accessible since early January 2003 because of a roof fall in the Hiawatha workings of Mine #1. SBC-9A replaced SBC-11 for monitoring water in this section of the #1 Mine; however, additional roof falls have made most of Mine #1, including SBC-9A, inaccessible. The flow from the culinary water supply pipe is now being monitored as SBC-9A: this new location for SBC-9A needs to be noted in the monitoring plan.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.
See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling Due Date

Renewal submittal due 07/02/00, renewal due 11/02/00. Baseline parameters are to be taken in August of year 5 prior to each permit renewal (Table 7.1-8). Baseline parameters were measured August 2000 and included with the First Quarter 2000 data submittal. Next baseline analysis will be in August 2005.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES ☒ NO ☐
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

4. Were irregularities found in the data?

YES ☒ NO ☐

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

SBC-3: Na (n = 37) was outside the two standard deviation range

SBC-4: Mg (n = 39), bicarbonate (n = 77), total alkalinity* (n = 73), and total anions* (n = 75) were outside the two standard deviation range. * - not a required parameter

5. Were DMR data submitted for all required sites?

1st month, YES ☒ NO ☐
2nd month, YES ☒ NO ☐
3rd month, YES ☒ NO ☐

Identify sites and months not monitored:

The data were submitted electronically as operational parameters.

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

When there is discharge, DMR parameters that are not included in the operational parameter lists in the MRP - such as sanitary wastes, visible foam, and floating solids - are not reported in the electronic submittal.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES ☐ NO ☒

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

In the fourth quarter of 2003, four sites had water temperatures that were outside the two standard deviation range, and it was recommended that the thermometer be checked for accuracy. There were not sufficient data during the first quarter 2004 to determine if there has been a change.

The MRP should be amended to show SBC-11 can no longer be monitored and that the flow from the culinary water supply pipe is now being monitored as SBC-9A.

Other irregularities in the water-quality parameters do not appear significant and, other than watching for possible trends, no further action is recommended.